

THE *Burd. 11.*
DOCTRINE
OF *K*

Passive Obedience,
AND
NON-RESISTANCE.
Stated ;

And its Consistence with Theology,
Reason, Justice, the Revolution,
our Laws and Policy, impartially
Consider'd.

Semper Eadem.

L O N D O N :

Printed for John Morphew, near Stationer's-
Hall, 1710.

THE
DOCTRINE

OF
PASSIVE OBEDIENCE

AND

NON-RESISTANCE

Said

And is Contrary to the
Teaching of the Revolution
our Laws are
Considered



George F. Johnson

LONDON

Printed for J. M. ...
1848

THE
DOCTRINE
OF
Passive Obedience,
AND
NON-RESISTANCE
Stated, &c.

Unity, Peace and Love are Things in their own Nature so truly Charming, and so justly endear themselves to all Mankind, that even the greatest Infringers of them always esteem it no small Addition to their Character, to be presented to the World as industrious Promoters of them. Avow'dly to declare for Strife and Division, would be as foolish as 'tis detestable; and he that should rashly venture upon such a Task, must immediately expect to be made the just Mark of all Mankind's Indignation. It is no wonder therefore to find the villainous Disturbers of our Repose, to be continually saluting our Ears with that (were it real) harmonious Sound, *Peace be with You*. But since our unhappy Experience too evidently convinces us of their Insincerity, and our own miserable Feuds and Animosities, which are so successfully propagated, by their Arts, amongst us, it highly concerns us to use our utmost Endeavours to detect such vile Incendiaries, and let them be as justly hateful to us, as they are to our Great Lord and Master, the Prince of Peace and Love.

Certainly Endeavours, so truly Noble, so publickly Beneficial, and so likely, once more, to make our Church and Kingdom happy, needs no Apologies, no Strains of Oratory, nor Flights of Eloquence, to recommend them. And therefore, tho' I can't but be Conscious with what Disadvantage I undertake this Work, and with what Variety of far abler Pens this Nation abounds, yet the Confusion that has industriously been made, having hitherto sufficiently employ'd them, gives me some Hopes, that some of those Observations I have made, in my private Sphere, may be a little useful.

Whilst therefore our ingenuous Clergy are defending the Doctrine of our Saviour, as well as our Church, with all that Learning and Cogency of Argument, as has ever given them the just Character of *Stupor Mundi*; I shall make it my Endeavour to give some of our deluded (tho' well-meaning) Members a right Apprehension of what is Contended about. For I am verily persuaded, nothing has more fatally contributed to the heightning our Differences, than the wrong Notions of them, which the Design of some, and the Ignorance of others, has dispers'd among us.

Amongst the many unhappy Instances of this kind that daily present themselves to our view, none affords us a more melancholly Scene than the (if rightly stated) truly Evangelical Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance.

For certainly had all that Warmth which of late has been shewn on both sides) been only the Effect of a sincere Zeal, for Truth, we should never have found, so industriously promoted by some, and so easily swallow'd by others, so many gross and extravagant Mistakes. Mistakes of that unaccountable Nature, that 'tis impossible to conceive how any Man, of Common Reason, could be guilty of them, without taking them upon the bare Word of those whose Interest it was to keep Matters in the dark.

How far any particular Persons are culpable herein, shall not be my present Business to enquire. Our Feuds require our utmost Endeavours to put an end to, not aggravate them. But this I conceive will not be altogether a useless Undertaking, to strive to give People right Apprehensions of the Question in debate.

These Words, *Passive Obedience*, and *Non-Resistance*, few, very few, are unacquainted with; we find them in every Body's Mouth, almost, wherever we go. But their Meaning has been so disingenuously perverted by some, whose Interest it is they should not be understood, that it renders it highly necessary to be very particular in our Enquiry after their real and proper Import.

First

First then, By *Passive* is not ment *Active Obedience*. This, no doubt, at first sight, will be thought wonderful informing; But certain it is, he must be very little conversant with those Deductions, which some (who are no doubt very ambitious to be thought Men of Argument continually urge to us (even from the Press) not to see the Justness of this Remark.

How often are we told, that the necessary Consequence of *Passive Obedience* is such, that whatever a Prince commands, be it never so sinful, we are oblig'd to do it, upon pain of Damnation? I am very sure, should a School-boy, that has only learn'd his *Accidecne*, be capable of distinguishing no better, he would justly merit a severe Castigation; it must then strangely surprize us, to find Men Men of Reason and Temper, as they pride themselves to be thought) in spite of Modesty and Common Grammar, inculcate such gross, such extravagant Mistakes. It is really worthy of Observation, to see how strangely fond too some Men are of this Topic, what Pains they take to dress it up, in all the fantastick Postures which Levity, Villany, or the want of Sense (for one of these it must be) can furnish them with. One while they tell us we must prostitute our Wives and Daughters, cut our Brother's Throat, nay hang our selves, whenever a Prince shall happen to be so mad as to bid us; another, that we must voluntarily sacrifice our Liberty, Property, Religion, and all that is dear and sacred to us; in a word, be ready to do every thing that a cruel and impious Tyrant can prompt us to; and lest we should think (as undoubtedly we have reason) they do not speak to us, they tell us, all these are Instances of Absolute *Passive Obedience*. We must confess, with Men of such Prowess of Argument, it is hard Contending: But yet we humbly conceive, as long as those Rules we learn'd from *Lilly* hold good, TO DO will always be found a Term of an Active Signification; and therefore we esteem our selves no further concern'd to clear our selves of all these Charges, than to tell them, 'tis not *Active*, but *Passive Obedience* we assert; and if they can't see the Difference between these two, the more is the pity.

Secondly, As (by *Passive Obedience*) I do not think my self oblig'd to do every thing, or indeed any thing, that is sinful, that a Prince shall command; neither do I think my self concern'd to omit every thing that he shall forbid; and therefore should he peremptorily prohibit my going to Church, or any other necessary part of my Duty, I should reckon his Prohibition of no Force, because it is superseded by a Superior Power; and my Answer would be that of the Apostle's, under the like Circumstances, it is better to Obey God than Man, and agreeable to their Example proceed as I did before.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, By *Passive Obedience* we do not think our selves in the least oblig'd to promote and assist an Arbitrary and Tyrannical Power; no, nor flatter any Prince that exercises such a Power, by telling him he does well, and as he ought to do. Neither do we think our selves oblig'd to seek after Wooden Shoes, nor use the least Endeavours to bring in the Pretender, (Pretender we say, for so we esteem him with respect to Hereditary, as well as other Right.) how evidently soever some may think such Proceedings deducible from what is asserted. In fine, by *Passive Obedience* we mean nothing that is in the least derogatory to that just Affection and profound Veneration we ought to bear to our present Gracious Sovereign Queen *Anne*, nor any thing that is exclusive of the most affectionate Loyalty towards Her.

Fourthly, But by *Passive Obedience* we mean, meekly and quietly to bear, or suffer what a Prince shall inflict upon us, when we cannot escape the Force of his Resentments by other means than Resistance. Which is the next Term, the Import of which it is necessary we should particularly consider.

1. By Resistance is not meant a bare Non-Compliance with a Prince's Desire; and therefore we don't esteem those chargeable with Resistance, (in the Sense we take it) who would not read King *James's* Declaration.

2. By Resistance is not meant the doing what is prohibited by a Prince, in case his Prohibition and the Commands of God stand in Competition.

3. By Resistance is not meant the remonstrating against a Prince's Proceedings, or any other verbal Opposition whatever.

4. Tho' it must be confess'd (if the word *Resistance* be taken in its full Latitude) the preceding general Negatives may be call'd *Resistance*; yet they are none of them that sort of *Resistance* we contend against. But by *Resistance* we mean the taking Arms to fight or coerce the Prince; the taking the Sword and smiting with it, as did *St. Peter*, when our Lord bid him put up his Sword.

Having stated and fixt the Meaning of the Terms contested about, our next Business is to consider the Truth of the Proposition contain'd in them; and in our Prosecution of this shall make use of these four Topics

First, We will consider the Theology of it. *Secondly*, The Reason and Justice of it. *Thirdly*, The Consistence it bears with our Laws. And *Fourthly*, Its Correspondency with sound and good Politics.

And

And First, We are to consider the Theology of the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*, and *Non-Resistance*. Now that we may proceed with all possible Clearness, we will examine the Terms distinctly, as before stated and settled in the Premises. First then we are to examine the Truth of the Proposition contain'd in the first Term, *Passive Obedience*.

I suppose it will here be readily admitted, that the Holy Scriptures are the only determinative Rule upon which we must proceed; and the express Precepts of them or evident Deductions from them, sufficient Demonstrations; and therefore from them, and them only, we shall draw what Arguments will be offer'd.

The Sacred Writings are so abundantly furnish'd with Rules of our Duty of this kind, that it would be really tedious to enumerate them; and therefore that we may proceed with Brevity as well as Clearness, and inform our Judgments without oppressing our Memory, we will consider some select Passages, that seem more particularly apposite to our purpose.

St. Paul laying down the Duty of Subjects to their Sovereign, expresses himself thus, viz. *Let every Soul be subject to the higher Powers*, &c. Rom. 13. 1. and speaking to Bishop Titus, says, *Put them in mind to be subject to Principalities and Powers, and to Obey Magistrates*, Tit. 3. 1. Again, *Ye must needs be subject, not only for Wrath, but also for Conscience sake*, Rom. 13. 5.

St. Peter, handling this Point, expresses himself thus, viz. *Submit your selves to every Ordinance of Man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the King as Supreme, or unto Governours as those that are sent by him*, 1 Pet. 2. 13. The Duty of Subjection and Submission is here so forcibly inculcated in the plain Words of these Texts, that 'twould be a real Detraction from the Cogency of what they deliver to make any Comment upon them; and indeed the Sense of 'em in general is not deny'd by even our greatest Antagonists, only they will have 'em taken under certain Restrictions or Limitations. They tell us, the Submission and Subjection here mention'd by the Apostles, is only requir'd of us to such things as are Lawful, and that when Magistrates exceed the Bounds of their Commission (which was given them for the Good of Society) by commanding or prohibiting any thing contrary to Law; Not only their Injunctions, but their Authority, nay their Superiority, is lost and void; and therefore, not only Obedience, but Subjection and Submission is no longer due unto them. Now this we utterly deny. For not to insist that the very Terms (Subjection and Submission) us'd in the Texts infer the contrary; (such a Procedure being not properly any Subjection, or Submission, to the Magistrate, but the Law anteceding his Commands;) I say, not to insist on this, the Words of St. Peter last cited irrefragably overthrow

overthrow it. For Submission is by him there requir'd, to every Ordinance of Man, Lawful or Unlawful, we are commanded to submit. From whence I thus argue, viz. Every Ordinance of Man is not Good or Lawful: But we must submit to every Ordinance of Man; therefore we must submit to such Ordinances as are not Good or Lawful. By Submission here, when the Thing requir'd is Unlawful, or what to comply with is Sinful, is meant not the Doing the thing; no, that would (as was before observ'd) be Active Obedience; but the meekly and quietly bearing, or suffer'ng the Penalty inflicted for not doing it; and this we call *Passive Obedience*. I would not be mistaken, we do not think our selves oblig'd to submit to the Command of the Magistrate in this Case, nay we ought not so to submit; but we think our selves oblig'd to submit to the Penalty, i. e. to whatever Punishment the Magistrate shall think fit to lay upon us, for not doing as he would have us; and this, I again say, is what we call *Passive Obedience*.

We are far from denying the Commission (even the Supreme) Magistrate has, is design'd by God for the Good of Society; and that every time he exceeds the Bounds of this Commission, in that Instance he acts without Authority, with respect *ad se*, or in a Moral Sense: But of this he is only accountable to God; we may indeed, in some Cases, tell him of it, and remonstrate the Sin and ill Consequences he necessarily involves himself in by it; but if this is to no purpose, we must quietly submit our selves and Cause to that God, who is *King of Kings, Lord of Lords, and only Ruler of Princes*; and shall count it no material Reflection to find this branded as a Servile and Slavish, if it can be prov'd a Christian Principle. This we are sure of, his exceeding his Commission won't excuse our neglecting our Duty: And since God Almighty has declar'd his Superiority over us, by commanding us to submit to him in every thing, either Actively or Passively, we cannot, we dare not, pretend to dispute any farther. But to proceed.

We are told, however general and extensive the Sacred Writings may be in several places, yet there must necessarily be some Exception (tho' not express'd) imply'd in them. For we are commanded to Obey (not only the Magistrate, but) our Parents in all things. Now tho' these Words are as general and extensive, as any that can be produc'd, for Obedience to the Magistrate, yet we must necessarily take them under some Limitations, or else we render the Obligation of several other of the Precepts of Holy Writ void, &c.

This

This is one Instance of those gross Mistakes that were taken notice of in our stating the Meaning of the Word *Passive Obedience*. For it is readily admitted, if by Obedience we here understand Active Obedience, the Words must of necessity be taken under several Restrictions: But if we apply them to *Passive Obedience*, I see no necessity for any. For tho' in a great many Instances I must not do what my Parents would have me, nay I ought not, yet I may, and ought patiently to suffer what they inflict on me for not doing it; and therefore tho' it be granted, that in this Case Active Obedience is under several Limitations, yet it does not from thence follow, that *Passive Obedience* is the same; and consequently is no Objection to what has been here insisted on.

It is further argu'd: Suppose the Matter toucheth a whole Community, and the Happiness of that be invaded by a Governour turn'd a publick Enemy to it, in the main part of his Conduct; can it possibly be thought that it is God's Will we should submit to him in this Case? Can it be suppos'd, that all Right of Self-Defence and Self-Preservation is taken from this whole Community, at a time when they are without any, in effect, establish'd Governour to protect them? Certainly, when a whole Nation find themselves so sensibly oppress'd, Nature it self will not suffer them to act consistent with this Principle; nor the powerful Law of Self-Preservation permit Men, of even the most Passive Tempers, quietly to submit to their Ruin, when it is in their Power to prevent it. And indeed, it seems highly to reflect on the Honour of Almighty God, to say in this Case, we ought to submit.

To all which we rejoyn: If the Question here propos'd (*viz.* can it possibly be thought that God Will, &c.) be ingenuously made, it is very easily resolv'd. For since God has declar'd what his Will is, all Doubts in the matter immediately vanish. It may not only possibly be thought, but certainly be known, we ought in this Case, tho' not Actively, yet Passively, to submit: And it can't possibly be imagin'd how any Body can think otherwise, who takes his open Declarations in the Holy Scriptures to be sufficient Indications of his Will. Whether all Right to Self-Defence and Self-Preservation is hereby taken away, I will not pretend now to determine: But this I will be peremptory in, that all such Right (if it must be call'd so) as is inconsistent with that Passive Submission requir'd by God, in this and all other Cases, is taken away. If Nature alone be consulted, it is readily acknowledg'd this Doctrine must fall; but how Nature alone came to be a Rule by which we must square the sublime Doctrines of the Cross, is a thing deserves a Scrutiny. *Skin for Skin, and*

all that a Man hath, will he give for his Life. This is the Language of Nature, and the powerful Law of Self-preservation, of which some Gentlemen are so fond: But yet our Blessed Lord assures us, *That he that will save his Life shall lose it, and he that will lose his Life for his sake shall save it.* A strange Paradox! to those who are stiff Contenders for the Dictates of Nature, and powerful Law of Self-Preservation. But as strange as 'tis, it's very certain, 'tis a Christian Truth; and as sure as NATURE is against it, it ought to be practis'd by all who own the Divine Authority of him that spoke it. What is consistent with the Honour of Almighty God, his own Infinite Wisdom best knows, and therefore undoubtedly he will never make any thing a necessary part of our Duty, but what is (however it may apper to us) strictly compatible to it. Since therefore Almighty God has thought fit to make it our Duty, to suffer Injuries with Patience, and has pronounc'd them Blessed who thus suffer for Righteousness sake; since he has assur'd us by his Apostle, that this is thank-worthy, if a Man for Conscience towards God endure Grief, Suffering wrongfully, it highly concerns us to consider, whether whilst we charge others with reflecting upon the Honour of God, we do not infringe it our selves, by disputing his peremptory Commands.

Having thus far endeavour'd to prove the Truth of what is contain'd in the first Term, *Passive Obedience*, and examin'd the Force of several material Objections, I might proceed to several other Arguments for its Confirmation. But being willing to contract the Bulk of these Papers, as much as possibly I can, shall wholly omit them, and proceed to the next Term that was to be consider'd, *viz. Non-Resistance.*

1. It is a known Rule, that every Affirmative necessarily implies a Negative. Thus he that asserts there is but one God, necessarily denies two, or any other Number; so here, those Texts which affirm the Duty of unlimited Obedience, Subjection and Submission, necessarily imply a Negation of Resistance. For when I resist my Submission ceases, and consequently I infringe the Obligation of the Text. And the Application is the same, with respect to Obedience and Subjection. But to be direct.

2. St. Paul having (as has been before observ'd) laid down the Duty of Subjection to the Higher Powers, proceeds to give the Reason thus, *viz. For there is no Power but of God.* And then draws this Conclusion, *Whosoever therefore resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves Damnation.* " Here (as the excellent Au-
" thor

“ thor of the † *Whole Duty of Man* expresses it) is very small
 “ Encouragement to any to rise up against the Lawful Ma-
 “ gistrate; for tho’ they should so far prosper here, as to se-
 “ cure themselves from him by this means, yet there is
 “ a King of Kings, from whom no Power can shelter them,
 “ and this Damnation in the close, will prove a sad prize of
 “ their Victories.

But the Gentlemen who think themselves concern’d to op-
 pose us here, tell us, These Words are not to be understood
 of the PERSON, but OFFICE of the Magistrate; granting
 therefore that the Office of Magistrates is from God, and
 therefore not to be resisted, yet when the Magistrate contradicts
 his Office (which was made for the Good of Society) he may,
 and ought to be resisted.

The Dispute between us is, whether by the Term, High-
 er Powers, is meant the Person, or Office of the Magistrate;
 and this the Holy Passages themselves will determine. St.
 Paul then goes on thus, *viz. For Rulers are not a Terror to*
good Works, but to the evil, v. 3. One would think the Apostle
 can’t possibly here mean any thing but the Persons of Ma-
 gistrates the word RULERS being an Appellation not in the
 least compatible with the Office of Magistrates. He pro-
 ceeds, *viz. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the Power? Do*
that which is good and thou shalt have Praise of the same, Ibid.
 Wilt thou then? The word THEN here is an Illative, refer-
 ring to, or drawn from, the preceding part of the Text,
 by which the word RULERS in the beginning, and the word
 POWER here, are apparently Synonymous Terms, and mean
 the same thing. So that the Persons who are call’d the HIGHER
 POWERS and the POWER, in the first and second Verses,
 and RULERS in the third, are the same which here are again
 call’d the POWERS; from which it is undeniable, that the
 Apostle means not the OFFICE, but the PERSON of the
 Magistrate. But further, *He is the Minister of God, &c. v. 4.* The
 Antecedent to the Relative *Ille*, here, is the HIGHER POW-
 ERS, or Rulers (*i. e.* the Magistrate) mention’d in the preceding
 Verses: And to go no further than the immediate Words, by
 the Pronoun *Ille* we can’t possibly understand any thing but
 the Person of the Magistrate. For to call the OFFICE of
 the Magistrate HE, would be the most extravagant Solecism
 that ever was. I might proceed yet further, to prove the
 Apostle here means the Person of the Magistrate, and pro-
 duce the concurrent Testimony of all Expositors to confirm

it; but being satisfy'd what has already been offer'd is sufficient, shall take it for granted, and again resume the Apostle's Argument, *viz. There is no Power but of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves Damnation.* I suppose the Authority of the Speaker will be a sufficient Demonstration of the Truth of both the Antecedent and Consequence, when it is consider'd the Apostle, the Great Apostle St. Paul, has really writ them, that they are genuine, and truly his, only remember, therefore, *That they that resist shall receive to themselves Damnation*; and then tell me, whether that is not a true Proposition which is contain'd in the Term *Non-Resistance*

But here we are desir'd to give a fair Account of the Matter, and to prove plainly, why it is that this general Prohibition of St. Paul's must be interpreted absolutely, and declar'd to be without Limitation

It is hard to imagine what such Gentlemen mean, by a fair Account, and what they esteem Proof. That St. Paul does, *de facto*, say, *That there is no Power but of God*, they can't but know; That by this Power is meant the Magistrate, they may know if they will; That all Magistrates don't do as they ought, no Men are more sensible than they; That notwithstanding this, if we resist them, we resist the Ordinance of God (for if there be no Magistrate but what is ordain'd of God, certainly the Bad as well as Good are included) the Apostle expressly asserts. Now, if we must resist neither the good Magistrate nor the bad, and that the resisting either of them is resisting the Ordinance of God, and thereby exposing our selves to Damnation, how can we take the Duty of *Non-Resistance* to be here commanded, otherwise than Absolutely, and without any Limitation?

To say that Queen Elizabeth, King James I. King Charles I. &c. acted disagreeable to this Doctrine, is to make bad (if not false) Premises, and worse Conclusions. For I am of my Lord Haverham's Opinion, That Authority, tho' it be the strongest Motive to incline the WILL, is the weakest Argument in all the World to convince the UNDERSTANDING.

3. If ever the drawing the Sword against the Magistrate can be justifiable, it must certainly have been so in the case of St. Peter, who drew it in the Defence of the best Cause, and the most innocent Person that ever was; yet neither the well-meant Zeal of the Apostle, nor the inveterate Malice of the Jews; the Innocence of our Lord, nor the apparent Danger Religion seem'd to be in by the violent Apprehension

prehesion of its Founder; in a word, neither the just Sense of their Oppression, nor the Plea of Self-Defence, could umbrage him from that severe Reprehension of the then injur'd Jesus: *Put up again thy Sword into his place, for all that take the Sword shall perish by the Sword*, Matt. 26, 50.

This Passage, is so Emphatic an Illustration, of what is here contested, and so manifestly obviates all that is urg'd against it, that the Gentlemen of all sorts, who oppose the Doctrine of *Non-Resistance*, use their utmost Efforts to evade the Force of it. Some tell us, The Reason why our Saviour here so severely reprehends St. Peter, was, because he oppos'd God's Decree, he being appointed to Die. Others say, That St. Peter exceeded the Bounds of that Liberty, which the natural Right of Self-Defence and Self-Preservation allows. Others alledge, that his Fault consisted in not staying for an Order from our Lord. The Jesuits (for however the matter happens, they are very solicitous about this place) say his Crime lay in this, that he rashly engag'd against such Odds, that in all probability he would inevitably lose his Life in the Conflict. But it is very certain, how true soever any, or all these Observations may be, with respect to St. Peter, our Lord's Reproof here carries Reason of perpetual Force; he does not say, because thou Peter hast taken the Sword, thou shalt perish by the Sword, but ALL that take the Sword shall perish by it. All are worthy to be put to Death, who at any time shall dare to draw the Sword against the Magistrate. " If then (as my Lord Bishop of *Lincoln* concludes † " in his Sermon on this Text) neither the Malice of the *Jews*, " nor the Innocence of our Lord; If neither the Truth of " Religion persecuted in its Founder, nor the apparent Marks " of Malice and Envy, of Violence and Oppression, which " appear'd in the whole course of their Prosecution of him, " were not sufficient to warrant St. Peter, to draw the Sword " in his Defence, against that legal Authority, by which they " acted; we must conclude, that neither will any of these " Pretences suffice, to justify any other Christians in like " Circumstances now: But if it shall please God at any time, " to permit the lawful Powers to be against us, and make " them that hate us to rule over us, we must follow the Ex- " ample of our Blessed Master, and submit patiently to their " Authority, and not with this warm Apostle take the Sword " against those to whom God has committed the Power of

† In his Sermon before the House of Lords, Jan. 30. 1708.
pag. 15,

" the Sword. Let this suffice (to' use his Lordship's Words) to shew what the true Christian Doctrine of Submission to the Civil Magistrate is.

I proceed now to the second Thing propos'd, namely, The Reason and Justice of this Doctrine.

1. All Bodies Politic necessarily consist of two Parts, *viz.* the Governing, and the Governed. The former of these has been thought so absolutely essential to their Constitution, even by such as can't in the least be suspected to have a partial Regard to us, that they have call'd it the CONSTITUTIVE REGENT, † and earnestly contended that there can be no such thing as a Body Politic without it. Now then, this Governing part or Constitutive Regent, here in *England*, we call the King. (or as 'tis now happily imbelish'd, the Queen) The Governed part we call Subjects. Now to assert the Governing Part, or Constitutive Regent, is accountable to, or may be punish'd or coerc'd by the Governed Part, is to invert the Reason and Eternal Nature of Things, and introduce the grossest Absurdities, and most extravagant Contradictions we can possibly be guilty of; such as to Be, and yet not to Be at the same time; to be the Governing part, and yet at the same time, to and by the same Person, to be Governed; to Subject him, and yet at the same time, to make him Subject to us; with a numerous Train of other Absurdities, as tedious to enumerate, as ridiculous to mention.

In Opposition to this it is said, it is evident from the very Nature of the Thing, and all Notions of Sovereign and Independent Government; it must be otherwise; because the Dernier Resort of Justice must of necessity be in the People, there being no other way of determining Controversies between Princes and their People, without making an Appeal to a Foreign Judicature, which has ever been condemn'd by all Protestants.

But now, how any Government can with any Propriety be call'd Sovereign and Independent, and yet Accountable to, and to be judg'd and Coerc'd by that Part of it which is call'd the Governed, is another Difficulty that wants solving. For if the Prince is to be judg'd by the People, when he is judg'd, he commences a Subject to them, and so consequently must cease to be an Independent Sovereign; because it depends upon

† Vid. *Mr. Taylor against Dr. Sherlock*, pag. 36, who alludes also to *Mr. Baxter*.

their Judgment, whether he is any Sovereign at all. Appeals to a Foreign Judicature, as the *Dernier Resort*, in case of Differences between a Prince and his Subjects, has been justly condemn'd, by Protestants, as a great Grievance; but Appeals to the Subjects themselves, as the *Dernier Resort*, may be justly reputed a greater. For not to urge the Unnaturalness of the Feet's judging the Head, with abundance of Contradictions of that kind (as has been before observ'd) nor the Inconveniency, not to say Injustice, of having so many Judges, with the Supposal, the Prince and his Subjects, are equal; nay, we will further suppose the Subjects superior to their Prince (for so indeed they must be to be his Judges, and this is a Supposition of a great Latitude) but supposing this, yet it would be a direct Infraction of the Eternal Rules of Justice and Equity, that even in this Case a Prince should be Judg'd, and consequent to that, Coerc'd by his Subjects.

For the Clearing this, we will yet further put the Case, with all the Advantage that is, or can be desir'd. We will suppose in direct Opposition to *St. Paul*, (who says, *There is no Power but of God*;) that there is no Power but of the People, and that whatever Power Princes have, it was conferr'd on them by Original Contract, in which were certain Conditions, which, if broken, made their Power void. We will suppose further, that these Conditions were known universally, and therefore the Breach of them could not possibly escape the Cognizance of the People. And further yet, that there were several Penalties which the Princes voluntarily agreed to suffer upon the Breach of them; and if all these be not Suppositions enough, I must confess my self at a loss to find any more. This then shall be the Case.

The Case thus represented, must be consider'd under two distinct Views, by which we shall be better able to judge of the Justice of the Procedure.

First then, We are to consider the Prince as a Prisoner at the Bar, Indicted and Arraign'd for Breach of Covenant.

Secondly, We are to consider the People, as Witnesses ready to make good the Indictment.

Now in Cases of this Nature there always is a Dispute, which by the Eternal Rules of Justice and Equity ought to be decided by some indifferent Person. For (it is suppos'd at least) both the Accuser, and the Accused, are always partial
in

in their own Cause; and therefore neither of them are qualify'd to pass a decisive Sentence. This being granted, the People, being here Parties, or Accusers, cannot be Judges, because being interested in the Cause (whether it be just or no) they would pronounce the Prince guilty; which, if granted, he would not have so much Justice done him, as the Vilest of his Subjects, and would be a greater Slave than the Meanest of his Guards.

Hard, very hard would be the Case of Princes, were it so? Is Liberty and Property so dear to Subjects, and is the Life of a Prince of no Value? Must he be the only Slave in a Kingdom? Shall even a common Malefactor be allow'd to appeal from his Accusers, and he alone be forc'd to be judg'd by them? Is it reckon'd such a Grievance to be subject to the Arbitrary Will and the Despotic Power of a Prince; and would it not be the same for a Prince to be so subject to his People! Why are we so Partial? Why must not the Prince's Welfare be consulted, as well as the People's?

There can never be a Necessity to be unjust; no Circumstances can alter the Nature of Things; Good is Good, and Evil is Evil, let it be done by whom it will. If then a Prince can neither be Judg'd nor Punish'd by his People without the most manifest Violation of even the common Laws of Justice, as 'tis very certain he cannot, then no Pretences whatever can justify such a Procedure. Not only Religion, but Reason; not only Christianity, but Justice; not only the Laws of God, but the known Laws of Equity, all unanimously conspire, and loudly call upon us, not to avenge our selves in this Case, but to refer our selves and Cause to be judg'd by that God to whom Vengeance belongs, who has given us such infallible Assurances, that *Vengeance is his, and he will repay it.*

We are not so abandon'd by the peculiar Genius of the *English* Nation, nor so stupidly ignorant of the mild Administration of our present Gracious Sovereign, to be Hunters after Chains, or Advocates for an Arbitrary and Tyrannical Power; but yet we can't but observe with what an invidious Disadvantage the Prince is generally represented. He is always put up as the only Aggressor and all Faults in the People, dissembled with the utmost Industry; whereas would we diligently and impartially attend to the Nature and Reason of Things, we could not but perceive, that the Prince is much more likely to be oppress'd by the People, than the People by the Prince. It's true, History does afford us some *Monsters*, some *Neroes*, some *Caligula's* some *Agathocles's*; but yet a Man must really be very much prejudic'd against Princes,

ces, not to know there has been a greater, far greater Number, just the Reverse of these, whose Qualities have been brighter than their Diadems, and Goodness as much exalted above the rest of Mankind, as their Stations; and indeed not to insist, that their Education is more rais'd, and consequently their Notions of Things more Noble and Sublime, and their Minds the less like to be tainted with the mean Vices of Insolence, Envy, &c. Princes are under less Temptations to oppress their Subjects, than they their Prince; for such Conduct as renders them injurious to their People, is so far from being any Addition to either their Grandeur or Power, or any thing else, which they generally place their Happiness in; that 'tis the likeliest Means to involve them in Trouble and Vexation. Whereas (not to mention the truly Generous, and justly Valuable Parts) even the least Imbellishments and most tinsel Pegeantry of a Crown, naturally raises the Ambition, and excites the Envy of its Beholders; and if their Strength be adequate to their Desires, a HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE will never be wanting; and one need not have the Wisdom of *Solomon* to guess what the Sentence will be, where the Accusers are Judges: *Naboth*, we all know, was soon found a Blasphemer, when *Ahab* had a mind to his Vineyard.

But we must (or else we shall never please some Gentlemen) suppose no Villany, no Avarice, no Ambition, no Insolence, no Traitorous Intentions, no Desires to sit at the Helm, can possibly be lodg'd in the Breasts of any of the People; but that they are all Submission, Peace, Love, Moderation, &c. and that if there be any such thing as Tyranny, any such thing as Oppression, they, Poor Creatures, are wholly innocent of it, and the Guilt of it lies altogether at the Prince's door. And because we won't give these Gentlemen any Displeasure, if we can help it, we will suppose all this too.

It may be remember'd, that by Resistance, it was said, was not understood the bare opposing a Prince's Will; and also, that we were not oblig'd to give him Active Obedience in Things unlawful. This being premis'd, it will soon appear, that a Prince is not able to Oppress his People, if he would never so fain. For if the People all keep steady to their Duty, and don't in the least recede from it; to gratify his Desires, it is out of his Power to affect them; if his Soldiers Desert him, or at least Disobey his Commands; if his Judges tell him his Proceedings are directly contrary to the Laws of the Land; if his Divines inculcate his Breach of his Coronation Oath, and thereby contracting the heinous

Guilt of Perjury; if his Council dissuades him, his Ministry neglects him; his Parliament expostulates, or admonishes him; and, in fine, his whole Kingdom remonstrates against his Conduct, and earnestly intreats him to desist so Oppressing them; if all this be done, as 'tis certain it may, and ought, what Prince can be so Savage, so void of Gratitude and common Humanity, still to continue Tyrannical to a People, which he can't but know deserve better Treatment, and more obliging Returns? Or at least, what Hurt can he do of himself to a People, all resolutely bent to Oppose (tho' not Fight) him, in all his unlawful Desires.

The Gentlemen who think themselves oblig'd, *ipso facto*, to down with the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*, and *Non-Resistance*, never leave hunting after Cases, till they think they have found one that will, and must inevitably sell it; and therefore they further suppose, that the Prince is still resolutely bent to bear down all Opposition, and utterly to subvert and extirpate all the municipal Laws of the Land, and to introduce his own Arbitrary and Despotic Will in their stead; and the better to effect this, gets a sufficient Number of either his own Subjects, or Foreigners to abbet and assist him in this his Unjust and Arbitrary Invasion of his Subjects Rights and Properties, and all the Municipal and Fundamental Laws of the Kingdom. And this they tell us was the Case at the Revolution

But this is a direct Inversion of the Question, and at once obviates all that pretended Inconsistency, which, with such a popular Clamour, is said to be between the Doctrine we contend for, and the Revolution. For tho' I may not arraign the Person of my Prince for any Breach of the Laws, yet certainly I may those that abbet and assist him. His being exempt from Punishment don't make them so too. They are not only accountable for infringing the Laws, but (as was charg'd on Dr. *Manwaring*, * when he was Impeach'd by the Commons) for Misguiding and Seducing the Conscience of the King, incensing his Royal Displeasure against his Subjects, averting his Mind from calling of Parliaments, alienating his Royal Heart from his People, and causing Jealousies, Sedition and Division in the Kingdom. They certainly may, and ought to be Impeach'd, and brought to Justice before the House of Lords; and if by having impos'd on, and abus'd the King's Mind, they violently oppose coming to Justice, the Nation ought unanimously by Arms to assist to bring them by force to a Tryal; and this would not

* *Proceedings of the Lords and Commons against Dr. Manwaring in 1628. p. 12.*

be to resist the King (in the Sense we take Resistance) but to bring Villains and Traytors (whatever he may think of them) to him, and his Government, to Justice. This, and this only, was the Resistance practis'd at the Revolution. The unhappy Prince, then on the Throne, was not personally resisted by Arms, nor intended to be hurt; but the villanous Gang of Jesuits that seduc'd him to such Arbitrary and Illegal Measures; they, and they only, were designedly Coerc'd. And this I shall prove by unquestionable Authority.

Our great Deliverer King *William*, then Prince of *Orange*, says in his Declaration, " * It is not to be imagin'd, that either those who have invited us, or those who have already come to assist us, can joyn in **A WICKED ATTEMPT OF CONQUEST, &c.** But if his Army had been brought to Dethrone and Depose the King, it had been a Conquest, over him, tho' not over the Nation. But this was so far from being allow'd by that Prince, that he afterwards caus'd a Book to be Burnt, for asserting it to be any Conquest at all. He tells us therefore in another place, what the Design of his Army was, and upon whom he design'd to employ it. " † We have brought with us (says he) a Force sufficient, by the Blessing of God, to defend us against the Violence of those **EVIL COUNSELLORS**. This place so plainly declares, that what Resistance was made by that Great Prince, was not intended against the Person of King *James*, that 'tis a Wonder to me, any Person that ever read it, can have such a Thought. His Force here, we see, was not levell'd against the King, but his **EVIL COUNSELLORS**; they, and they only, are the Persons he here mentions, that he came to Resist. Agreeable to this, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal assembled at *Guild-Hall*, express themselves, *viz.* " * That they would assist his Highness, with their utmost Endeavours, in obtaining a Free Parliament, with all speed, and preserving, as much as in them lay, the Peace and Security of the Cities of *London* and *Westminster*, by taking care to disarm all *Papists* and to secure all *Jesuits* and *Romish Priests*, &c. Here we see again, 'tis not the Person of the King, but of *Jesuits*, *Papists* and *Romish Priests*, that were to be disarm'd and secur'd.

Our Gracious Sovereign's Royal Consort, giving the Reasons of his Proceedings, in a Letter to King *James*, expresses himself as follows, *viz.* " While the restless Spirits of the Enemies of the Reform'd Religion, back'd by the cruel Zeal and prevailing Power of *France*, justly alarm and unite all

* Additional Notes of his Decl. † Decl. Art. 21. * *Vid.* Decl. of Lords Spiritual, &c.

“ the Protestant Princes in Christendom, and engage them
 “ in so vast an Expence for the Support of it, can I act so de-
 “ generous and mean a part, as to deny my Concurrence to
 “ such worthy Endeavours for the DISABUSING YOUR
 “ MAJESTY by the Reinforcement of those Laws, and the
 “ Re-establishment of that Government, on which alone de-
 “ pends the * WELL-BEING OF YOUR MAJESTY, and
 “ of the Protestant Religion in *Europe*? This, Sir, is that
 “ irresistible and only Cause that could come in Competition
 “ with my Duty, and Obligations to your Majesty, and be
 “ able to tear me from you, while the same AFFECTIONATE
 “ DESIRE of serving you still continues in me.

“ This (to use the Words of a Gentleman, who applies
 “ this Passage to another Sense) is a sufficient Justification of
 “ the Prince, and Her present Majesty, who as they were Il-
 “ lustrious Examples of Conjugal Love, did certainly act by
 “ Concert in this most important Passage of their Lives.

A Justification indeed, that they intended by the Opposi-
 tion they made to his Proceedings, no Hurt to the King's
 Person, that the Arms they were engag'd in, were not design'd
 to Resist him, but those Traiterous, those Villanous *Jesuits*
 and *Papists*, which had so unhappily abus'd and impos'd on
 him. This was, this must have been their Intention, or else
 we must put a Sense, so disingenuous, so perfidious, on the
 Words, as when it is consider'd how Noble, how truly AU-
 GUST the Persons were from whom they came, is horrible
 to think on.

Her Majesty, as She has been a bright Example of several
 other resplendent Virtues, and by Her personal Merits laid a
 just Claim to a brighter Diadem, than She at present, to us,
 so happily adorns; so She has no less endear'd Herself to the
 more generous part of Mankind, by the inviolable Love and
 Affection She always bore to the unhappy Prince her Father.
 This is no adulatory Encomium: 'Tis what is universally known;
 notwithstanding of late Her truly resplendant Qualities have
 been basely sully'd by the nauseous Panegyrics of a parcel of
 Mercenary Harpies, and Her Sacred Person, in the same
 Breath, prais'd, and obviously branded, with the Names of Re-
 bel and Usurper; Words! enough to shock the very Souls of
 all that truly love Her! Words! that ought in some to be
 answer'd with Gibbets instead of Reasons. What the Inten-
 tion of this daring Insolence is, is hard to to imagine: They
 only, who use such traiterously atrocious Language, have
 Thoughts black enough to conceive it. But this is certain,

* Letter of Prince George.

the Practice is most wretchedly flagrant, and become the common Cant of a Party.

Some may, I believe are, even in this, insignificant Tools, Fellows, that have no other notion of Argument, but ill Words, and take him always to be the best Logician, who bawls loudest. But certainly all can't be so; Words of this Nature must have some Design, especially if we reflect on the Methods they take in giving their Reasons. It may justly surprize us, to hear Men (how fond soever of the Idol Moderation) as vehement, Oh! as hot as Fire, against the Pretender, and yet stare at you, and ready to ram his Birth-right down your Throat. We alafs! we, poor silly Creatures as we are, because when they are angry with us, they call us *Jacobites*, are apt, in spite of a RECORD IN CHANCERY, to say he has no Birth-right at all; whereas they, in pure Zeal they tell us for the Queen, (and to be sure they don't tell a Lye, because they speak seriously) that he is really the Legitimate Son of King *James*. It's true, they tell us, he was thought once to be an Imposture, and that by King *William* too; * but it's plain now to the contrary, because the Queen had a Child in *France*: But yet the Non-jurors are a Pack of Dogs and Rogues, to pretend to bring him in, and deserve to be hang'd, (I suppose for pretending to be more officious than they, to serve the young Gentleman.)

A Man of a sprightly Genius might find Matter enough here for Satyr; but yet, if the Nature and Tendency of such Expressions be seriously weigh'd, they will rather excite our Grief than Mirth. To find the avow'd Declarations of our Late Glorious Deliverer, King *William*, exploded by a Popular Odium, and all his repeated Affirmations, express'd in every Article of his Declaration, that he came here to oppose the King's Evil Counsellors, and with no Design to make any Conquest, pass'd by, and paid no deference to: To find all that sincere Love, and undissembled Affection, which our Gracious Sovereign, and her Royal Consort evidenc'd, not only in Words, but in Deeds, to her Father, villanously dress'd up, as if it was design'd only to palliate the Intentions they had to Murder him, and that her Majesty intended, by one Act, to contract the Guilt of Rebellion and Patricide. Good God! What horrible Suggestions are these? Was ever the Innocence of a Prince so Arraign'd! Did ever such daring Calumnies before escape with Impunity!

The Revolution was an Action in its every Part so truly Glorious, so worthy of a Heart INTIRELY ENGLISH; such a Demonstration of our Church's not Canting, but Ra-

* Decl. Art. 19.

tional Zeal against Popery? such a noble Rescue of our Religion, Laws, Liberties and Properties from the Jaws of Idolatry, Superstition and Tyranny; and carry'd on by Persons so truly Illustrious in their Virtues as well as Stations, that 'tis impossible for a Man to be a Good Church-man, a Good Subject, and a Good English-man; not to approve and speak of it in the highest Terms of Honour and Respect. But to say this was founded on the Blood of our King; for so it was (if our Blessed Lord be allow'd a good Casuist, who always lays the Morality of any Action upon the Intention of the Actor) if his Blood was intended to be shed: To say that King *William* and Prince *George*, or yet worse, Queen *Mary*, and our present Sovereign, in Contradiction to their open and avow'd Declarations, Actions I might say, design'd any Resistance to the Person of that unhappy Prince, King *James*, is certainly to asperse and calumniate the Revolution. It is readily acknowledg'd, 'tis impossible to know the Heart of any one. There may be some who say all this, and say it (as they tell us) in pure Zeal for Her Majesty: But this we are very certain, it is not then a Zeal according to Knowledge. And it were further to be wish'd, they would keep the Heat of it within doors, and not so industriously endeavour to fire the whole Nation with it.

That there was Resistance at the Revolution, and Resistance by Arms, we readily acknowledge. We are not so ignorant, but that we know of the Battle at the *Boyn*; at least some Gentlemen have taken abundance of pains to make us know of it. But yet we deny, for all this, that there was any Hurt intended to the Person of the King; it was directly Resisting his Will, we own; but as to any Resistance to his Person (had he been wounded in the Battle) it had been purely accidental, and therefore no Resistance at all, in a Moral Sense, because undesign'd. But the Resistance at the *Boyn* (if we must be particular) was to Coerce the King's Evil Counsellors, or Defend our selves against the Invasion of a Foreign Enemy; for it is very well known, there was abundance of *French-men* kill'd in the Battle. Now if some Men are so zealous for the Credit of the Queen, and the Revolution, that they won't distinguish between the Cutting off Traytors, either in a Judicial or Hostile way, or Defending our selves against the Invasion of a Foreign Enemy, and Cutting off our King, we can't make them. But this we will say (with my Lord Bishop of *Carlisle*) * " That our Foundations, 'tis to be hop'd, are not shaken by the " Weight of those many, great and extraordinary Revolu-

* In his Sermon 30th of Jan. 1702. pag. 31.

“ tions that have pass’d upon us. The All-wise Providence
 “ of God has frequently of late (and as some of us have al-
 “ ways thought very graciously) exchange’d our Governours.
 “ But if we ungratefully alter our Notions of the Divine
 “ Right of Government, and throw off our Ancient and
 “ Primitive Rules of Obedience, we shall make an unworthy
 “ Return of the Mercies we have receiv’d.

And so much may suffice, to evince what Correspondency the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience* bears, not only to the Eternal Rules of Reason and Justice, but the Preservation of a Nation, under the immediate Lashes of a Tyrannical Prince, and particularly to our late Glorious and Happy Revolution.

We come now to the Third Thing propos’d, *viz.* The Agreeableness of this Doctrine to our Laws.

The Learned Gentlemen of the Long-Robe will easily excuse this so extraordinary a Sally, into what is in a peculiar manner their Province, when they consider a late Affair has made every Body Lawyers in this Point.

This then is the Language of one of our Acts of Parliament. * “ And be it hereby further declar’d, that by the
 “ undoubted and Fundamental Laws of this Kingdom, nei-
 “ ther the Peers of this Realm, nor the Commons, nor Both
 “ together, in Parliament, or out of Parliament, nor the Peo-
 “ ple Collectively, or Representatively, nor any other Per-
 “ sons whatsoever, ever had, have, hath, or ought to have,
 “ any Coercive Power over the Persons of the Kings of this
 “ Realm.

In answer to this it is urg’d, That this Act is Repeal’d; the Truth of which we come now to consider.

It is agreed, it is not expressly in Words Repeal’d by the Gentlemen themselves, but Consequentially, and by necessary Deduction. Their Reasons are these two. First, Because it interferes with the Revolution, which is approv’d of, and confirm’d by our Laws. Secondly, Because ’tis contrary to the Tenour of a late Act, which absolves the Subjects of this Kingdom from their Allegiance, in case the Prince is reconcil’d to Popery, by Marriage, or any otherways. To which we distinctly rejoin.

First, That the First Reason is founded upon a Supposition, false in Fact, *viz.* That the Person of the King was Coerc’d at the Revolution. But it has been prov’d, that his Person neither was, nor intended to have been, Coerc’d at the Revolution; therefore the Act here contested, does not interfere with the Revolution.

* 12 Car. 2. cap. 30.

But because we are now upon the Law of the Point, and this may be thought a Repetition, we will now examine how they express themselves in this matter. The Commons considering this matter, after the King had left the Nation, made this following Vote; † " Resolv'd, That King *James II.* having endeavour'd to subvert the Constitution of the Kingdom, by breaking the Original Contract between King and People; and by Advice of Jesuits, and other wicked Persons, having violated the Fundamental Laws of this Kingdom, and having withdrawn himself out of this Kingdom, has Abdicated the Government, and the Throne is thereby become vacant. This Vote afterwards Commenc'd into an Act of Parliament. The Law is so far from asserting any Coercive Power to be here us'd over the Person of the King, as the Means of his Absence from the Kingdom, that it expressly affirms his Absence to be the Effect of his own free Choice. It's true, it recounts the Reasons inducing him to such a Procedure, *viz.* his attending to the Advice of Jesuits, and having thereby subverted the Fundamental Laws of the Land; But it does not in the least speak of his Abdication, as any Penalty inflicted on him; he was not FORC'D OUT, he WITHDREW HIMSELF; and therefore was no ways Coerc'd, in the Sense of the Law.

To the *Second* Reason we likewise rejoyne, That tho' it be readily admitted, in case the Prince be reconcil'd to Popery, we are absolv'd from all our Allegiance to him; yet it does not from hence necessarily follow, that we have a Coercive Power over his Person. For there is a manifest Difference between Punishing, and not Obeying. Certainly I may refuse the doing what a Prince requires, yet use no Violence against his Person. Obey him Actively I must not, neither must I Resist him; and he that can't see the Reason of this, can't distinguish between Fighting, and Standing still. That we must not give Active Obedience to the Prince, in case his Commands be unlawful, has been all along asserted: And what does this Law say more? Does this any where say, you shall Coerce the Person of the King? No, most certainly it don't. How then is the Law, which denies the People's having any Coercive Power over the Persons of the Kings of this Realm, contrary to the Tenor of this, wherein it is Repeal'd by it?

It is an easy matter, by Noise and Assurance, to bear some modest People down, that this Law is Repeal'd: But I believe a Man might look himself Blind, both in the Statute, and Common Law-Books of this Kingdom, as well as the Laws of

God, to find one Clause for the Peoples having a Coercive Power over the Person of the King, or Queen; and till such a Place be found, we must conclude, the Use of such a Power is, as the Act we have cited declares it, against the undoubted and Fundamental Laws of this Kingdom.

The King of England (says a great Doctor of our Laws) is, * *Summus Totius Regni Anglicani Justiciarius*, Supreme Lord Chief Justice of England, and the Dernier Resort, from whence there is no Appeal. To him, and him only, belongs the Prerogative of making War and Peace, &c. And so tender is the Law of his Person, that barely to imagine his Death is Treason; and Treason is a Crime of so high a Nature, in the Eye of the Law, that it will scarcely admit the Heirs of a Traytor to survive them; *Est enim tam grave Crimen* (saith Braston) *ut vix permittatur heredibus quod vivant.*

Rex Angliæ, non potest Cuiquam injuriam facere, is another well-known Maxim in our Laws. Not that Simply, or Morally consider'd, this is true; but he can't so offer an Injury, as to come under the Sanction of the Laws, to be punish'd for it. So we have another Maxim, *Rex Angliæ, non potest errare*, For as God is perfect (saith Dr. Chamberlayne) so the Law will have no Imperfection found in the King.

All which consider'd, will give an impartial Man some Reason to think, our Laws are not so inconsistent with the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*, and *Non-Resistance*, as some have represented them.

I come now to the Fourth and last Thing propos'd, namely, The Consistence it bears with sound and good Politics.

That Steady, as well as Excellent Ornament of our Church, my Lord Arch-bishop of York, has so fully express'd himself, on this Point, that a Transcription of his Words will be very useful, viz. † " That there is a Submission due from all Subjects to the Supreme Authority of the Place where they live, as shall tie up their Hands from Opposing or Resisting it by Force, is evident from the very Nature and End of Political Society; and I dare say, there is not that Country upon Earth, let the Form of their Government be what it will (Absolute Monarchy, Aristocracy, or Commonwealth) where this is not a part of the Constitution. Subjects must Obey *Passively*, where they cannot Obey *Actively*, otherwise the Government would be precarious, and the Public Peace at the Mercy of every Male-Content, and a Door would be set open to all the Insurrections and Treasons in the World.

* Dr. Chamb. in his *Present State of England*.

† *Serm. before the Lords, Jan. 30th, 1700. pag 19.*

So Restless is the Ambition, so Implacable the Malice, so Powerful the Envy, so Daring the Insolence, so every way Uneasy the Tempers, and so Rebellious the Principles of some, God knows, too many People, that did not Religion, Reason, Justice, Law, and all that can possibly put any Restraint upon them, loudly cry out against their rising against Governours, Government it self would soon be at an end, and the whole World a Melancholy Scene of Anarchy and Confusion. All Law would be Strength, all Success Goodness, all Justice Oppression, all Faith Faction, all Religion Rebellion, Scaffolds and Blocks the common Catastrophes of Princes, Leagues and Covenants the Subversion of Churches, and Sacrilege and long Prayers the Means to devour its Revenues. In fine, Heresy and Schism, Sedition and Rebellion, Avarice and Oppression, Rapine and Hypocrisy, and all the other dismal Consequences of a distracted and flagitious Nation, would for ever flourish and abound.

And is there any thing in these inviting? Is there any Charms in Confusion, or Harmony in Discord? Is it a Crime even in us to think of these Things? We that know, that have felt the Truth of them. Far be it from me, to pretend to search into the dark Arcana's of Politics; my Vanity has not yet so elated me, as to make me aim at the Name of Politician: But yet this, I believe, I may venture to put up as a general Maxim, *That those Principles, which are most Conducive, and are best Calculated to the Good and Preservation of Society, ought always to be embrac'd.*

This being granted (and I think it can be deny'd by none, but what are fond of Dissolution, as well as Revolution) the Application will be very easy.

As in the Natural Body the Amputation of a Leg, or any other Member, may possibly be sustain'd without an intire Dissolution, but the least Incision made in the Head has a natural Tendency to it; so in a Body Politic, the Cutting off even a sound Member may possibly be born, but the like Procedure upon the Head consequently dissolves the whole: So that as the Good of the Body in general is to be consulted before any particular Member, and the Preservation of it wholly endeavour'd, without any regard (in case of Competition) to any other Part; so likewise the Good of Society in general is to be attended to, before the particular Disadvantage of any of its Members: It being a known and universally receiv'd Rule, *That in Competition of Evils, we ought always to chuse the least.*

Besides (as has been before observ'd) it is more probable (were we no ways to consider the greater Mischief of it) that the People should be Aggressors, than the King. Because it
would

would be really great Folly in the King, to give them such a Temptation to rise against him. People are apt (God knows too apt) to Rebel, without being provok'd to it; no Bands are strong enough to tie some Wretches to their Duty. Now to suppose that Princes, who can't but know this, will have so little regard to their own Safety, as to give such People the Plea of being oppress'd for their Rebellion, is to suppose them as Weak as Tyrannical, as Foolish as Cruel.

But were it so, it must be the People's own Fault, if he hurts them, he is but one Man himself; and if all the People are resolutely bent not to Obey him Actively, and severely to punish his Adherents, 'tis impossible he should any ways hurt them.

If he and his Adherents are so strong, that they can't be so manag'd, then even Resistance will do us no Service; We must be *Passive*, when we can't be *Active*. *Hugh Peters* himself was *Passively* Obedient at the Gallows.

Where then is that Necessity for Resistance, as some so earnestly contend for, since we may as well, nay better, preserve our selves without it? One would think, the unhappy Consequences we of this Nation particularly have involv'd our selves into by Resistance; That Innocent Royal Blood, which we have just Reason to think still cries for Vengeance against us; That constant Series of Confusion, which has ever since been its unhappy Appendant: Our present Feuds and Animosities, Distractions and Divisions, would now all present themselves to our view, with Argument more moving, than Language can possibly form. Let this then plead, let this convince us of the Impiety, Injustice, Unlawfulness and Impolicy of Resistance.

But however inconsistent the Doctrine of Resistance may be with the Nature and Ends of Government in general, we are told, our Constitution now is establish'd upon it; The Revolution was, and Protestant Succession now is, founded upon Resistance; and in case Resistance is condemn'd, they must fall.

It were well, if the Gentlemen who assert all this, were such good Friends to our present Constitution, as they would be thought to be. For to say our Constitution is founded upon a Principle, inconsistent with the Nature and Ends of Government, is certainly to give such an Account of it, as is not much for its Credit. But because this Notion also has been noisily dispers'd among us, it seems to be a necessary part of our present Business, to consider the Grounds of it.

First then, We will consider the Revolution. *Secondly*, The Protestant Succession,

The Revolution was declar'd by the chief Persons concern'd in it, to be carry'd on with no Design to hurt the King's Person; and after its Confirmation, was declar'd by our Law not the Effect of Coercion, but Abdication. This being the Case, it does not in the least appear, that the Revolution is any ways concern'd with the Doctrine of Resistance.

But were it (as some Gentlemen so earnestly contend) certain, that the Means us'd to bring about the Revolution, was Resistance: yet it does not from thence in the least follow, that the Revolution would necessarily fall upon the Condemnation of the Doctrine of Resistance. For certainly it is possible to condemn the Means, without so much as disapproving of the End. The Revolution is certainly good, if (to name nothing else) the Enjoyment of the Protestant Religion be so; yet that does not in the least prove Resistance to be the same. Our Blessed Saviour's Dying for the Sins of the World, was, to be sure, very good; yet that does not in the least prove the Perfidiousness of *Judas*, and the Malice of the *Jews* (which were the Means of his Death) were good also. So that all as could be inferr'd, were the Case so, is (I must condemn) the Means us'd to bring about the Revolution; but should not in the least be oblig'd to condemn the Revolution it self; for tho' I ought to eschew Evil, yet I ought also to hold fast what is Good.

The Protestant Succession is so far from interfering with the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*, and *Non-Resistance*, that nothing can be a more effectual Means to Corroborate and Establish it. For if Resistance, on any Pretence, be unlawful, then not only the Pretence of Tyranny, but of Hereditary and Indefeasible Right, is also excluded; and whatever the Non-jurors may think of this, it is out of the Power of all the Wit and Logick of Man, to infer their Notion of Hereditary and Indefeasible Right from the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*, and *Non-Resistance*. That all Princes are *Jure Divino*, we have learn'd from *St. Paul*; but that this *Jure Divino* consists in Hereditary Right, he has no where told us: Nay, he tells us further, the Powers that then were, were *Jure Divino*; but they, it's very certain, could lay no Claim to any thing of that kind, being advanc'd to the Throne by the Voice of their Soldiers, or the Edge of their Swords, or several other ways; and therefore to resist, upon the Pretence of Hereditary and Indefeasible Right, is as much condemn'd, as any other Pretence whatever. This I mention, to shew the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*, and *Non-Resistance*, yea and *Jure Divino* too, is no Enemy to the Protestant Succession; and therefore can't justly be charg'd with having any Tendency to sap and overthrow our Constitution.

Having

Having thus gone thro' the Four Particulars propos'd, I find my self yet under a Necessity of considering another Argument (for so 'tis call'd) which tho' it does not come under the Cognizance of any thing has yet been offer'd, is Loudly (the Gentlemen must pardon me, for I cannot say Rationally) insisted on; and we have hitherto done nothing, if this be not consider'd.

The Argument (for so it shall be call'd, because we won't quarrel) is this, *viz.* We will not practise this Doctrine, *ergo* 'tis false.

Now because these Gentlemen are so very peremptory in the matter, that we may not be behind hand with them in Assurance, for once, we will venture (*i. e.* if they'll promise not to stare at us) to deny both the Antecedent and the Consequence. And as a Reason of this our Negation, say, First, That we will practise it. A peremptory Affirmation is as good at any time as a peremptory Negation; and so there's one Answer.

But Second, If by saying we will not practise this Doctrine, their Meaning is, that we cannot practise it; we answer, it has been practis'd by others, and therefore may by us. That it has been practis'd by others, my Lord Bishop of *Sarum* has given us so Elegant, as well as full Proof, that I can't but transcribe it; his Words are these,

† “ The Blessed Apostles follow'd their Master's Steps in
 “ this, as in all other things; and therefore having learn'd
 “ of our Saviour that Lesson of bearing the Cross, and Suf-
 “ fering patiently, when unjustly persecuted, counted it their
 “ Glory to be conformable to him in his Sufferings; and indeed
 “ if we examine the Nature and Design of that Holy Religion,
 “ our Saviour deliver'd, we will find nothing more Diame-
 “ trically opposite to all its Rules, than the Distemper'd Fu-
 “ ry of these misguided Zealots, who being carry'd on by
 “ the Fierceness of their ungovern'd Passions, have upon Co-
 “ lours of Religion, fill'd the World with Blood and Confusi-
 “ on. Otherwise does St. *Paul* teach the *Romans* in this Chap-
 “ ter, tho' then groaning under the severest Rigours of Bon-
 “ dage and Tyranny; and St. *Peter* doth at full length, once
 “ and again, call in all Christians to prepare for Sufferings,
 “ and to bear them patiently; and tho' the Bondage of the
 “ Slaves was heavy, and highly contrary to all the Freedoms
 “ of Humane Nature, yet he exhorts them to bear the Se-
 “ verities even of their froward and unjust Masters, with

† In his *Serm. Obedience for Conscience sake*, last Edit. p. 41,
 42, 43, 44.

"this Argument, That Christ suffer'd for them, leaving them an
 "Example, that they should follow his Steps

"From these unerring Practices and Precepts must all true
 "Christians take the Measures of their Actions, and the Rules
 "of their Life. And indeed the first Converts to Christianity
 "embrac'd the Cross, and not only bore it with Patience, but
 "with Joy; and as long as Christianity continu'd pure and un-
 "allay'd, this Doctrine of patient Suffering was not only a big
 "and empty Boast, but gave Proofs of its Reality, by the un-
 "exampled Patience and Sufferings of the Christians, in a Suc-
 "cession of three Ages, and ten Persecutions. These Blessed
 "Witnesses of our Faith were burning and shining Lights, as
 "well by the Purity of their Lives, as by the Stakes and
 "Flames of their Martyrdom. Nero unpal'd them, and cloth-
 "ing them with Pitch-Coats, made them burn as Torches in
 "the Night. But these Fires scatter'd the Darkness of that
 "Night of Idolatry, in which Rome lay buried, and both en-
 "lighten'd and inflam'd many that lay freezing in Darkness.
 "It was the Astonishment of the World, to see such Numbers
 "of all Ages, Sexes and Qualities, with that Alacrity and Cheer-
 "fulness of Submission, offer up their Lives for the Faith; and
 "neither the Cruelty of their unrelenting Persecutors, nor the
 "continu'd Tract of their Miseries, which did not end, but
 "with their Days, prevail'd on them to renounce the Faith,
 "or do that which was next degree to it, throw of the Cross,
 "and betake themselves to seditious Practices for their Preser-
 "vation, but continu'd stedfast, both in their Faith and Pati-
 "ence, by which they inherited the Promises. Nor was Chri-
 "stianity endamag'd by all that Fury; on the contrary, the
 "Blood of the Martyrs was the Seed of the Church, whose
 "Field being thus fatned, did spring up Thirty, Sixty, and an
 "Hundred fold; so that for every new Harvest of a Persecuti-
 "on, there was a plentiful Crop of Christians. And there is
 "no Reason to think these Blessed Martyrs endur'd all their Suf-
 "ferings, constrain'd by Necessity, because they could do no
 "other; for as we find in the Inspir'd History, that at two
 "Sermons there were Eight thousand Converts; so Profane,
 "as well as Ecclesiastical Writers, assure us; the Numbers of
 "the Christians became very soon so vast, that nothing but
 "the Conscience of the Duty they ow'd the Supreme Powers,
 "oblig'd them to be subject. * *Pliny*, who liv'd 100 Years after
 "our Saviour, wrote to *Trajan*, that in *Pontus* and *Bithynia* there
 "were great Numbers of Christians of all Ranks, both in Ci-
 "ties and Villages; so that the Temples of their Gods were,
 "by the prevailing Growth of Christianity, left desolate. A

* *Lib. 10. Ep. 97.*

“ little after him, *Marcus Aurelius* had a Legion of Christians
 “ in his Army, of whom he gives this Character in his Edict,
 “ *That they carry'd God in their Consciences.* And when there
 “ were so many in the Army, we may on a fair Computation
 “ reckon their Numbers to have been very great. Not long
 “ after that, does *Tertullian* plead for those in his Days, in his
 “ admir'd Appologetic, and tells the *Romans*, † “ That if they
 “ would stand to their own Defence, they wanted not the
 “ Strength of Numbers and Armies; that neither the *Moors*,
 “ nor *Parthians*, nor any other of the Nations that fought
 “ with the *Romans*, could match them; who fill'd the whole
 “ World, all their Places, Towns, Islands, Castles, Villages,
 “ Councils, Camps, Tribes, Senate and Market-places; only
 “ they abandon'd their Temples to them, adding, * “ That to
 “ what War were they not both fit and ready, even tho' they
 “ were less numerous, who were butcher'd so willingly, if
 “ their Discipline did not allow them rather to be kill'd than
 “ to kill? And elsewhere he vindicates the Christians, “ That
 “ none of them were ever found guilty of Conspiracies against
 “ the Emperors, whom they acknowledg'd to be set up by
 “ God, and judg'd themselves bound to Love, Reverence
 “ and Honour them. But as the Christian Religion continu'd
 “ to spread by a vast and prodigious Increase, so did the
 “ Spight of the Infernal Furies grow fierce against it, by the
 “ same Proportion. And in the last Persecution, which continu'd
 “ about 20 Years, we find the Martyrs of one Province
 “ (*Egypt*) reckon'd to be betwixt eight and nine Million, and
 “ yet no Tumults was rais'd against all this Tyranny and Injustice.
 “ And tho' after the Emperors turn'd Christian, and
 “ Establish'd the Faith by Law, yet neither did the subtil Attempts
 “ of *Julian* the Apostate, nor the open Persecutions of
 “ some *Arian* Emperors, who did with great Violence prosecute
 “ the Orthodox, occasion any seditious Combination against
 “ Authority. These are the great Precedents this Holy Doctrine
 “ of the Cross hath in the first and purest Ages, and tho' Religion
 “ suffer'd great Decays in the Succession of many
 “ Ages, yet for the first ten Centuries, no Father, or Doctor of
 “ the Church, nor any Assembly of Church-men, did ever
 “ teach, maintain or justify any Rebellious or Seditious Doctrines
 “ or Practices”. So far his Lordship.

But were it suppos'd, that this Doctrine neither was, nor
 would be practis'd, we deny the Consequence, That therefore
 it would be False.

The Rules of our Duty in this, as well as in all other
 Cases, is drawn, from the Word of God; not from what

† Cap. 37. * *Ad Scap. c. 2.*

we will, but from what we ought to do; if therefore this Doctrine be declar'd in the Word of God to be his Will, whether we will practise it or no, it is nevertheless a true Doctrine, and ought to be inculcated as such. The Truth of this is so evident, that were it not admitted, no Doctrine, at least few Christian Doctrines, could be prov'd true, the whole System of our Holy Faith being almost one continu'd Contradiction to the Practice of this degenerate Age.

Blessed be God, we live in a Reign that does not in the least put us to the Practice of this Doctrine. We have a Queen, who (in this, in some measure, assimilates her self to Almighty God, who) will rather receive [an Injury, than offer one. Her Reign is, or at least ought to be, establish'd in our Affections, as well as Conscience. Let us then, in so good, so beneficent a Reign, be asham'd to deny, in Principle, what was by the primitive and best Christians, even in the most Tyrannic Reigns, so Nobly, so Gloriously reduc'd to Practice. Let us not for shame, when we have no Temptation, any more endeavour to bear down all Law, Sacred, Moral and Civil; nor ruffle the Serenity of Her Majesty's Royal Mind, by raising QUESTIONS, indeed OF A VERY HIGH NATURE, were they consider'd; but if we must be starting Questions of this kind, let them not be How, and When we may Rebel, but how we shall gratefully enough acknowledge the inestimable Benefits of Her Majesty's Auspicious Government; and since Heaven has so abundantly Bless'd us in One, that so justly claims the endearing Character of the BEST OF QUEENS. Let us all with an incessant Emulation, strive to be Her most Loyal, and Best of Subjects.



F I N I S.

is
d,
e
h
r,
ed
d
e
a
lf
nd
d
to
e,
ne
o
a-
d,
s
Y
ce
d
h
u-
y
e-
f-
of

